

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, March 15, 2010
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
Minutes (approved 4/19/2010)

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:10 p.m.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: T. Anderson, D. Bell, R. Boyd, K. Brown, C. Coski, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, K. Hicks for J. Lein, D. Ingram, D. Miles for Kalenkoski, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer

College of Business: A. Gupta for R. Frost, L. Hoshower, T. Stock

College of Education: N. Muhammad for T. Franklin, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Giesey, H. Pasic

College of Fine Arts: D. McDiarmid, M. Phillips, A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas

Group II: R. Barlag for H. Burstein, M. Sisson

College of Health and Human Services: D. Bolon, M. Li

College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coschigano, J. Wolf

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: R. Knight, A. Rumble

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern: E. McCown

Regional Campus—Zanesville: J. Benson, P. Kanwar for M. Nern

Scripps College of Communication: E. Graham for J. Bernt, G. Newton, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: W. Roosenburg, T. Heckman

Absent: E. Ammarell for P. Jung, S. Patterson, J. Dill, J. Thomas

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. President McDavis and EVPP Benoit
 - II. Roll Call and Approval of the February 22, 2010 Minutes
 - III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
 - Updates and Announcements
 - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: April 19, 2010, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
 - Resolution On Budget Planning Council's Recommendation Concerning Budget Assumptions
 - IV. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
 - V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
 - Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School (First Reading)
 - VI. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano
 - Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School (First Reading)
 - VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth
 - VIII. New Business
 - IX. Adjournment
-

I. President McDavis and Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit

President McDavis addressed two topics:

1) Capital Budget: The timeline for the capital budget (biannual funding from the state for capital projects) is not yet set, but OU anticipates approximately \$20 million primarily for Scripps and Clippinger. There may be limited additional funding for some smaller improvements across campus.

2) Public/Private Partnerships: OU is exploring the possibility of renovating or replacing student housing with a public private partnership, beginning with South Green (except Adams Hall). These dorms were built in 1970 or earlier, have not had significant renovations since they were built, and are not included in the capital plan for improvements for the next ten years.

There are four different models for the project: 1) The university could finance the project through bonds: OU would retain total control of the project, but the bonds have an adverse impact on the university balance sheet because we would absorb the total debt. 2) The university could create a separate affiliated entity to run the project: OU would still have a lot of control, but our credit rating would be affected. 3) The university could lease property to a private developer who would use corporate debt to fund the project. The debt would stay off the balance sheet, but we would have to give up some control. 4) The university could sell the property to private developer. We would see proceeds from the sale and there would be no negative impact on our credit rating or balance sheet, but we would cede far more control and create competition in housing. Two major companies have done this type of work: American Campus Communities and Capstone Communities. We have put out a request for information.

In order to reserve more time for discussion of the budget, EVVP Benoit distributed a handout with updates on enrollment and the Academic Health Center, summarized below:

Enrollment update:

	Freshman	Masters	Ph.D.
Apps this year/last year	12,959/13,729	not provided	not provided
Change in apps	-770		
Final admits this year/last year	1318/1167	+192	+25
Change in final admits	+151	+16	-2
ACT this year/last year	24.11/24.09	n/a	n/a
Change in ACT	+.02		
GPA this year/last year	3.38/3.40		
Change in GPA	-.02		

Academic Health Center update: Benoit received a memo with recommendations from Jack Brose and Randy Leite that draw on input from the Academic Health Center Steering Committee. McDavis and Benoit will discuss the memo before making further decisions.

Benoit then discussed the budget. The budget crisis this year follows a \$10.4 million shortfall in state funding. The budget process changed this year in an attempt to be as strategic as possible by: 1) determining which activities are essential, and which can be reduced/eliminated; and 2) deciding how to reallocate resources to our academic strengths. Benoit emphasized the changes made in the budget process this year, especially the level of budget detail examined, the alignment of budget decisions with articulated priorities, and the ongoing discussions with

planning unit heads. Benoit also discussed areas to improve for next year: there was not enough time this year for a comprehensive discussion about budgets and structure across and within units, and the reallocation of resources has not been addressed. The budget process will be refined for next year, but Benoit hopes to preserve some elements, including the budget forums, and the attempt to seek input from university community through the budget web site.

Benoit said that while the budget proposal protects current group I faculty, it does include reductions in contingent faculty. Feedback from the forums indicated that these reductions would harm the university's ability to generate revenue, offer adequate sections of classes, and would damage morale. This led to the Budget Planning Council's (BPC) proposal (3/12/10) to reduce the raise pool for faculty, classified staff, and administrators from 2% to 1%, putting approximately \$1.6 million back into the budget; \$1 million would be used to preserve instructional capacity, and \$600,000 would fund Ohio College Opportunity Grant replacement scholarships. Some BPC discussion suggested deeper cuts in academic support units rather than lowering the raise pool. Benoit said that she did not believe this was possible this year, but OIT will have an additional \$405,000 reduction, which will be reallocated to room costs for students.

Benoit concluded by saying that lowering the raise pool to 1% is not a perfect solution, but it is an institutional solution, shared by faculty, administrators, and staff. She added that we cannot change the past, but we can trust each other in future. The budget recommendations continue to be revised and are a work in progress, but Benoit stated that they tried to base them on the best available data; to listen sincerely to all members of the university; to consult with constituent leaders; to understand the consequences of the budget recommendations; and to clearly communicate the rationale for budget decisions. What they have learned this year will carry through to multi-year budgets. McDavis and Benoit then took questions.

Ken Brown asked why faculty should give up \$1.6 million while athletics receives \$15 million a year. **Benoit** responded that ICA has taken a 7% cut; **Brown** countered that ICA has seen a 50% increase in the last five years, while academic priorities have not received this increase in funding. **Andy Snow** proposed that university employees could voluntarily donate 1% of their salaries (or more) to the OU foundation. **Benoit** said that this would not make the money available soon enough to keep instructors in the classroom now, although she does encourage donations. **Lorie LaPierre** asked whether a 1% pay cut across the board, including coaching staff, was a possibility. **Chris Bartone** noted that there has been deferred maintenance for a long time. Auxiliaries makes money; has money been diverted from auxiliaries for other things (e.g. athletics) rather than being used toward maintenance? **McDavis** said this was not the case: although it does make money, it would take 43 years to complete the renovation using only the money earned from auxiliaries. He added that this is a problem we have not addressed, and we need to figure out how to adequately address this going forward. **Joe Slade** noted that is difficult to accept statements in good faith when it seems that discussing significant cuts to athletics is off the table.

Kenneth Hicks clarified with **Benoit** that the 1% raise pool was for all university employees. **Duane McDiarmid** argued that any cut should be progressive; 1% is a lot at the bottom, and nothing at the top. He added that the poor get poorer and the rich get richer; we should make a correction to that legacy. **David Bell** noted that some of the faculty members being laid off are the spouses of group I faculty; how could we possibly vote to reduce salaries when family members are getting laid off? Another senator noted that there was no assurance that raises would become a priority when times are better. The senator also objected to using the term "raise": it is not a raise because we are already below a cost of living increase. We are

really talking about a slightly smaller pay cut depending on the raise pool. **Benoit** responded that preserving raises should be a priority, but it is a balancing issue.

Leon Hoshower asked whether the \$1 million to be reallocated from the raise pool to instructional resources would stay in departments/colleges. Benoit said this money would be held in the Provost's office to be sent strategically to departments and colleges. **Charlotte Elster** noted that staff were important support for faculty work, too, and clarified with Benoit that although the reduction in the raise pool would apply to all employees, the "instructional resources" that would be preserved are only group II, III, and IV faculty, not group I faculty, and not administrative or classified employees. **Alyssa Bernstein** said that according to FutureOU, funding to the natural science departments has decreased 25% while funding for ICA has increased 50%. Given that there are no significant cuts planned for ICA next year, Bernstein asked McDavis to articulate the strategy behind increasing athletic funding over the past five years while the overall budget has been cut more than \$50 million, and asked whether it was time to change that strategy. **John Day** said he was not able to confirm the asserted 25% cut in funding to natural sciences. **Steve Hays** explained that the approximate figure was from the College of A & S actual expenses over five years, and offered to send that information to Benoit and Day. **McDavis** added that while we have had \$52-54 million in cuts over the past several years, he did not know where the other figures came from and could not respond to them. **Brown** reiterated that while we were cutting \$50+ million, ICA received an additional \$5 million. **Jim Andrews** returned to issue of public/private partnerships, and said he would like to see OU retain some control of programming, especially with respect to residential learning communities. **McDavis** agreed that it would be important to maintain that control contractually. **Slade** asked whether we would set the fees; **McDavis** responded that would depend on which scenario we were to follow. **Joe Bernt** asked if these dorms were built in the 1960s-1970s, why are they not paid off? **Mike Angelini** replied that they are paid for. **Bernt** then asked if the dorms are paid off, where is the student money that has been collected for housing? Where has it gone if not toward the dorms? **Angelini** responded that it has been used for other institutional priorities, such as academic buildings, so our overall debt load has not gone down.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the February 22, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes of the February 22, 2010 meeting were approved by voice vote.

III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- Updates and Announcements
The nominating committee will contact Senators soon about upcoming elections.
- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: April 19, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

Sense of the Senate Resolution on Budget Planning Council Recommendation Concerning Budget Assumptions

McLaughlin introduced this resolution in response to a proposal voted on by BPC the previous Friday. He noted that the resolution is presented without endorsement by the executive committee. He has received passionate responses on both sides since the resolution was sent out

on Saturday; now Faculty Senate needs to debate the issue and vote as a representative body. The faculty senate executive committee and others have made it clear that we believe that other cuts in non-academic units are possible and should happen before any cuts in academic areas.

David Ingram moved that the meeting be closed to all but group I and group II faculty. **Ken Hicks** seconded. It was argued that closing the meeting would protect untenured and non-tenure track faculty; others argued to keep the meeting open to promote transparency. The motion to close the meeting was defeated by voice vote.

Discussion about the resolution was similar to the objections to the BPC recommendation discussed with EVVP Benoit. Additionally, faculty members noted the recent growth in administrative staff in the Office of the President and EVVP, discussed the possibility of rebalancing tuition and general fees to direct more funds to academics rather than intercollegiate athletics, and argued that maintaining competitive salaries to retain strong faculty is critical to our academic infrastructure – that the long term academic health of OU is at stake. Arguments in favor of the resolution were to preserve instructional capacity and jobs, although there was some concern based on past practice that there was no guarantee that layoffs would necessarily be avoided.

Joe Slade moved to suspend the rules and go directly to a second reading and vote; **Ingram** seconded. The motion to suspend the rules passed (by secret ballot): 33 for, 8 opposed, 1 abstention.

Hearing no objections, **McLaughlin** called for a vote on the resolution by secret ballot. The resolution was defeated: 7 in favor, 35 opposed, 2 abstentions.

Steve Hays then introduced a new resolution (titled "Amended Resolution concerning Budget Planning Council Recommendation") that opposed the BPC proposal, called for more cuts in non-academic areas, and expressed a willingness to revisit compensation issues once other non-academic cuts have been exhausted.

Slade moved to suspend the rules and go to second reading and vote; **John Benson** seconded. The motion to suspend the rules passed (by secret ballot): 34 in favor, 6 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Patrick Munhall moved that the resolution be amended to remove most of the "whereas" clauses; **Mark Phillips** seconded. The motion passed (by show of hands): 21 in favor, 14 opposed.

Faculty Senate took a five-minute break to compose a shorter version of the resolution that focused on looking for cuts first in intercollegiate athletics, in areas where there has been non-academic administrative growth, and in other unnecessary expenditures. Faculty Senate then reconvened to consider the amended resolution (titled "Sense of the Senate Resolution Concerning the Budget Planning Council Recommendation").

Hearing no objection, **McLaughlin** called for a vote on the amended resolution by secret ballot. The motion carried: 37 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.

IV. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly

The committee report was postponed until the next meeting.

V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School (First Reading)
The first reading was postponed until the next meeting.

VI. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano

- Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School (First Reading)
The first reading was postponed until the next meeting.

VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth

The committee report was postponed until the next meeting.

VIII. New Business

None.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:55 p.m.

Resolution On Budget Planning Council Recommendation Concerning Budget Assumptions

Executive Committee*

March 15, 2010

Defeated 3/15/2010

Whereas the process for recommendations regarding the FY11 University budget are entering their final stages; and

Whereas feedback from the campus community on the February 15 budget recommendations has identified the need to better protect the academic mission of teaching, research, and creative activity; and

Whereas, in light of that priority, feedback has also provided mixed messages about the willingness of faculty and staff to recommend a 2% raise pool as part of the budget; and

Whereas, on March 12, Budget Planning Council debated a motion to recommend reducing the raise pool for all university employees from 2% to 1% with the understanding that the estimated \$1.6 million in savings would be used to protect instructional resources (group II, III and IV faculty (approximately \$1 million)) and provide need-based Ohio College Opportunity Grant replacement scholarship funding (approximately \$.6 million); and

Whereas the vote on this motion was 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 7 abstentions; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate resolution on Current Priorities approved on November 16, 2009 identified both faculty compensation and the maintenance and enhancement of tenure-track and continuing faculty as “central to the vitality and success of the University”;

Be it resolved that the Ohio University Faculty Senate endorses the recommendation for a reduction in the raise pool from 2% to 1% with the savings to be used for the activities detailed above.

*This resolution is presented by the Executive Committee without an endorsement for or against.

Sense of the Senate Resolution Concerning the Budget Planning Council Recommendation
PASSED 3/15/2010

Be it resolved:

Faculty Senate steadfastly and emphatically opposes the March 12 Budget Planning Council proposal. Our opposition to any such concession of faculty and staff compensation will continue unless and until the administration, in concert with Faculty Senate, shall produce an analysis of the university’s financial and organizational structure resulting in dramatic cost reductions in non-core, non-revenue-producing functions including:

- Intercollegiate Athletics, whose cost to campus has virtually doubled during the past nine years to its current cost of at least \$15.3M, which dwarfs any possible savings from cuts to faculty compensation;
- Non-academic administrative growth
- Unnecessary expenditures

**Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for
Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School
Interdisciplinary Council – 2009-2010
First Reading Postponed to 4/19/2010**

Introductory Notes:

- It is recognized that this proposal, intended to support faculty interests during annual review and promotion & tenure processes, may generate other questions dealing with organizational structure and funding.
- The members of the Interdisciplinary Council, a Standing Committee of Ohio University, argue that addressing P & T guidelines for faculty with a singular home department/school is a first step in improving the organization structure on which ID programs/faculty rely.
- Questions and challenges related to the organizational structure/policy of dual/shared faculty appointments are not addressed in this proposal.
- It is not the intent of this proposal to require interdisciplinary endeavors of faculty, but to ensure that when faculty engage in interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service that their efforts are recognized and included in annual review and P & T decisions.

Whereas

We must perfect organizational structures at Ohio University to support interdisciplinary endeavors. Interdisciplinarity emerges from and relies on the foundational strengths of our individual disciplines which, in turn, enable faculty and students to explore the most pressing questions of today. Through an organized effort to identify, support and reward such endeavors, including interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service, Ohio University will be better positioned to provide academic experiences for our students, attract and retain nationally recognized faculty, and become more competitive in securing external funding.

Whereas

Since Ohio University has not established university or college-wide policies for faculty in dual or shared appointments, it is necessary in the meantime to clarify responsibilities of faculty who have home departments but assume responsibilities in interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service.

Whereas

Reports from faculty and constituent groups “call for a better integration of research and creative activity into undergraduate and graduate academic priorities and noted that special consideration should be given to interdisciplinary efforts. . .”

(http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf, page 13).

Whereas

Vision Ohio challenges the Ohio University community to explore methods of “how to foster more interdisciplinary partnerships in teaching, scholarship and creative activity”

(http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf, page 13).

Whereas

The formal and informal arrangements through which interdisciplinary work is currently accomplished vary widely and appropriately across the university. Examples include formal dual or joint appointments, recognized interdisciplinary responsibility in a department or program not in the home department, and emerging or relatively short-term research interests or teaching interests. All exist and present different challenges in evaluation within the P&T

process. One policy cannot address all of those situations. First attention should be given to those faculty with recognized and expected interdisciplinary responsibility across department or program lines.

Whereas

Department/School, program directors and faculty should negotiate P & T guidelines to clearly establish procedures for departmental committees and administrators, as well as for candidates. Transparent and efficient guidelines are strongly in the best interests of the university as a whole.

Be it resolved that

the following be added to the Ohio University Faculty Handbook as II.E.2 of *Procedures for Tenure and Advancement in Rank and Recommendations for Salary Increase* and all subsequent numbers be increased accordingly.

2. To ensure proper recognition of faculty with a singular home Department/School who engage in interdisciplinary activities the home Department/School P & T Committee should insure that the Department/School P & T guidelines explicitly clarify how and to what extent interdisciplinary activities (teaching, research/creative activities and/or service) will be assigned, evaluated and included in annual faculty evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions.
 - a. Home Department/School (chair or director), program directors and the interdisciplinary faculty should negotiate and define the types of interdisciplinary activities (teaching, research/creative activities and/or service) deemed appropriate. Departments/Schools and faculty should negotiate *a priori* to determine the extent to which a faculty's participation in interdisciplinary programs (e.g. Environmental Studies, African American Studies, International Development Studies, etc.) or other programs will be credited. Any renegotiations/changes should be documented and incorporated into annual reviews and/or promotion/tenure reviews.
 - b. For faculty annual reviews the faculty/candidate and the merit/review committee will be informed of the negotiated commitment in writing. In annual reviews, credit should be given for interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching and/or service, as negotiated. How much credit given should be clearly indicated in annual evaluations.
 - c. For candidates during promotion and tenure reviews, the faculty/candidate and the P&T Committee will be informed of the negotiated commitment in writing. In the P&T decision, credit should be given for interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching and/or service, as negotiated. How much credit given should be clearly indicated in annual evaluations (as stated above) and in the P&T committee's letter of recommendation for a candidate.

**Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School
First Reading Postponed to 4/19/2010**

Whereas the Voinovich Center has now been restructured and approved as a School by the Board of Trustees;

Whereas faculty in the Voinovich School are entitled to representation on the Faculty Senate;
and

Whereas Section VI. A. Article 1 Reads:

Article 1 Composition and Election

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-eight Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of the degree colleges of the Athens campus and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean and having Group I faculty shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.

Be it resolved

The Voinovich School will have one Senator on Faculty Senate. The May 2010 nominations and elections will reflect this addition;

And be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook VI. A. Article 1 be changed to the following [changes in bolded italics]:

Article 1 Composition and Election

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-eight Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of the degree colleges of the Athens campus, ***the Voinovich School***, and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean and having Group I faculty, ***and the Voinovich School*** shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.